

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

ANGELA V. JONES,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 12-2792-STA-tmp
)	
FEDERAL EXPRESS,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter comes to the Court on the Report and Recommendation (D.E. # 6) of the United States Magistrate Judge filed May 15, 2013. Plaintiff Angela V. Jones (“Jones”) filed a Motion (D.E. # 7) on May 30, 2013, which the Court construes as an objection to the Report and Recommendation. For the reasons laid out herein, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and **DISMISSES** Jones’ suit against Defendant Federal Express (“FedEx”).

The district courts may refer dispositive matters to a magistrate judge for issuance of a report and recommendation.¹ A party may file objections to the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days of service of the magistrate judge’s report.² A district court reviews any portions of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendations to

¹ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).

² *Id.*

which a party timely objects *de novo*.³ However, a party objecting to the magistrate judge's report and recommendations must identify specific concerns, as a court will consider a general objection a failure to object at all.⁴

Jones' objections consist of nothing more than assertions that she intended to "motion the court in regards to the information that [she] filed," and that she "had a lot going on lately," as reasons for her failure to serve FedEx.⁵ Jones makes no specific objection to any error of law or fact in the Report and Recommendation. On a review of the record, it appears the Court has made every effort to allow Jones to effectuate service and avoid dismissal of her case.⁶ Both the 120 days allowed for service under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) and the additional time granted by this Court are long past. Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and **DISMISSES** Jones' suit against FedEx.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ S. Thomas Anderson
S. THOMAS ANDERSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: June 17, 2013.

³ 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C); *United States v. Worley*, 193 F.3d 380, 383 (6th Cir. 1999).

⁴ *McCready v. Kamminga*, 113 F. App'x 47, 49 (6th Cir. 2004) (citing *Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991)).

⁵ Pl.'s Motion, D.E. # 7.

⁶ See Order to Issue and Effect Service of Process, D.E. # 3 (directing Jones to serve FedEx by February 27, 2013); Order to Show Cause, D.E. # 5 (directing Jones to show cause by April 23, 2013, why she had not complied with the Order to Issue and Effect Service of Process and warning that a failure to show cause could result in dismissal of her case).